arXiv:1603.02107v1 [math.LO] 7 Mar 2016

Structural Properties of $\mathcal{R}_2$ Part II

Timothy J. Carlson
The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210 USA
email: carlson@math.ohio-state.edu

Abstract. This is the second of two papers establishing structural properties of $\mathcal{R}_2$, the structure giving rise to pure patterns of resemblance of order two, which partially underly the results in [2] and [3] as well as other work in the area.

For the entire paper, we will assume ρ is an arbitrary additively indecomposable ordinal and α is an epsilon number greater than ρ. By Lemma 5.8 of [4], κ_α^ρ is additively indecomposable.

The *Order Reduction Theorem* says that for $\eta < \theta_2^\rho(\alpha)$, $J_{\alpha,\eta}^\rho$ is essentially isomorphic to an initial segment of $\mathcal{R}_2^\alpha$. The important point is that this reduction reduces the lengths of chains in $\leq_2$: if the longest chain of elements of $J_{\alpha,\eta}^\rho$ with respect to $\leq_2$ has length $n+1$ where $n \in \omega$ then the longest chain among the elements of the corresponding initial segment of $\mathcal{R}_2^\alpha$ with respect to the analogue of $\leq_2$ in $\mathcal{R}_2^\alpha$ has length at most n.

The *Second Recurrence Theorem for* $\leq_2$ says roughly that the initial segment of $\mathcal{R}_2^\alpha$ corresponding to I_{ω^η} grows by adding ρ new intervals of the form I_β^α each time η increases. In the case $\rho = 1$, which is essentially $\mathcal{R}_2$, this says one new interval is added each time η increases.

Section 1 contains background.

Section 2 introduces the notion of *local incompressibility*.

Section 3 establishes the Order Reduction Theorem.

Section 4 establishes the Second Recurrence Theorem for $\leq_2$.

1 Preliminaries

We will use the notation from [4] except we will need to be more careful about parameters in definitions as we now discuss. As in [4], our metatheory

is $\mathsf{KP}\omega$, Kripke-Platek set theory with the axiom of infinity (see [1]).

Assume X is a set of ordinals and σ is an additively indecomposable ordinal. We will say that X is *σ-closed* if it is closed in $\mathcal{R}^\sigma$ (recall the definition of *closed* from [4] which is not the same as being topologically closed). We will say that a map $h : X \to ORD$ is a *σ-covering* of X if h is a covering of X, as a substructure of $\mathcal{R}^\sigma_2$, in $\mathcal{R}^\sigma_2$. Similarly, $\tilde{X}$ is a *σ-covering* of X if $\tilde{X}$ is a covering of X when X and $\tilde{X}$ are viewed as a substructures of $\mathcal{R}^\sigma_2$. Similary, we will say that h is a *σ-embedding* of X if h is an embedding of X, as a substructure of $\mathcal{R}^\sigma_2$, into $\mathcal{R}^\sigma_2$. We will say that h is a *σ-isomorphism* of X and Y if h is an isomorphism of X and Y as substructures of $\mathcal{R}^\sigma_2$. We will say X and Y are *σ-isomorphic* if there is a σ-isomorphism of X and Y. We will also write $X \cong_\sigma Y$ when X and Y are σ-isomorphic. On the other hand, we will almost always use the notation κ^σ_ξ, I^σ_ξ, θ^σ_1, $index^\sigma$, $\theta^\sigma_2(\beta)$, $\nu^\sigma_{\beta,\xi}$, $J^\sigma_{\beta,\xi}$ and $\overline{J}^\sigma_{\beta,\xi}$ in the case $\sigma = \rho$ and $\beta = \alpha$. So, we continue to suppress parameters in this case and write κ_ξ, I_ξ, θ_1, $index$, θ_2, ν_ξ, J_ξ and $\overline{J}_\xi$ respectively.

2 Local Incompressibility

Recall that the Recurrence Theorem for Small Intervals (Theorem 8.1 of [4]), which will be abbreviated as RTSI, implies the following.

- For all δ and $0 < \chi_1 \leq \chi_2 < \kappa_\alpha$

$$\kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \chi_1 \leq^\rho_k \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \chi_2 \quad \text{iff} \quad \chi_1 \leq^\rho_k \chi_2$$

- For all δ and all $0 < \chi < \kappa_\alpha$
  - $\kappa \not\leq^\rho_2 \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \chi$ whenever $\kappa \leq \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$.
  - $\kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \chi \not\leq^\rho_1 \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha$.
- For all ordinals δ_1, δ_2 and χ with $\delta_1 \leq \delta_2$ and $0 < \chi < \kappa_\alpha$,

$$\kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_1 \leq^\rho_1 \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \chi \quad \text{iff} \quad \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_1 \leq^\rho_1 \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \kappa_\gamma$$

  where $\gamma = index(\chi)$.

For the third part, use the fact that $\kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \kappa_\gamma \leq^\rho_1 \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \chi$ (by the first part).

Definition 2.1 *Assume X is a set of ordinals. Let M be the collection of ordinals μ such that μ is divisible by κ_α and $X \cap [\mu, \mu+\kappa_\alpha) \neq \emptyset$. For $\mu \in M$, there is a unique nonempty subset R_μ of κ_α such that $X \cap [\mu, \mu+\kappa_\alpha) = \mu + R_\mu$. The indexed family R_μ $(\mu \in M)$ will be called the* **interval decomposition** *of X. If $0 \in R_\mu$ and R_μ is incompressible for each $\mu \in M$, we will say that X is* **locally incompressible**.

Notice that X is ρ-closed iff R_μ is ρ-closed for all $\mu \in M$. Moreover, X is κ_α-closed iff $0 \in R_\mu$ for all $\mu \in M$. Hence, if X is locally incompressible then X is both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed.

Lemma 2.2 *Assume X is a finite ρ-closed set of ordinals with interval decomposition R_μ $(\mu \in M)$.*

1. *Assume X' has interval decomposition R'_μ $(\mu \in M)$. If R'_μ is either a ρ-incompressible ρ-covering of R_μ or $R'_\mu = R_\mu$ for $\mu \in M$ then X' is a ρ-covering of X.*

2. *Assume μ_1 and μ_2 are divisible by κ_α and $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$. If $\mu_1 \leq X < \mu_2 + \kappa_\gamma$ where $\gamma < \alpha$ then there is a locally incompressible set X' such that $X \subseteq X'$ and $\mu_1 \leq X' < \mu_2 + \kappa_\gamma$.*

3. *Assume X is locally incompressible. If h is a ρ-covering of X such that $h(\mu)$ is divisible by κ_α for all $\mu \in M$ then*

$$h(\mu + \chi) \geq h(\mu) + \kappa_\gamma$$

whenever $\chi \in R_\mu$ and $\chi \in I_\gamma$.

Proof. For part 1, let h_μ be the ρ-covering of R_μ onto R'_μ. Define h on X by $h(\mu + \chi) = \mu + h_\mu(\chi)$ whenever $\chi \in R_\mu$. Since ρ divides κ_α, Lemma 2.4 of [4] implies h is an embedding of X into $\mathcal{R}^\rho$.

Notice that if $\mu \in M \cap X$ then $h(\mu) = \mu + h_\mu(0) = \mu + 0 = \mu$ (since $index(h_\mu(0)) \leq index(0) = 0$).

To show h is a ρ-covering, assume $\chi_i \in R_{\mu_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\mu_1 + \chi_1 <^\rho_k \mu_2 + \chi_2$. We will show $h(\mu_1 + \chi_1) \leq^\rho_k h(\mu_2 + \chi_2)$.

First consider the case when $\chi_1 \neq 0$. By RTSI, $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. Let μ be the common value. By RTSI again, $\chi_1 \leq^\rho_k \chi_2$. Since h_μ is a ρ-covering, $h_\mu(\chi_1) \leq^\rho_k h_\mu(\chi_2)$. By RTSI once again, $\mu + h_\mu(\chi_1) \leq^\rho_k \mu + h_\mu(\chi_2)$ i.e. $h(\mu_1 + \chi_1) \leq^\rho_k h(\mu_2 + \chi_2)$.

Now consider the case when $\chi_1 = 0$. If $\chi_2 = 0$ then $h(\mu_i) = \mu_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ from which the desired conclusion is trivial. Assume $\chi_2 \neq 0$. By RTSI, $k = 1$. Let $\gamma = index(\chi_2)$. So, $\kappa_\gamma \leq \chi_2 \leq max_1(\kappa_\gamma)$. By RTSI, $\mu_2 + \kappa_\gamma \leq^\rho_1 \mu_2 + max_1(\kappa_\gamma)$. Since $\mu_1 \leq^\rho_1 \mu_2 + \chi_2$, $\mu_1 \leq^\rho_1 \mu_2 + max_1(\kappa_\gamma)$. Since $index(h_{\mu_2}(\chi_2)) \leq \gamma$, $h_{\mu_2}(\chi_2) \leq max_1(\kappa_\gamma)$. Therefore, $h(\mu_1) = \mu_1 \leq^\rho_1 \mu_2 + h_{\mu_2}(\chi_2) = h(\mu_2 + \chi_2)$.

For part 2, let R_μ ($\mu \in M$) be the interval decomposition of X. For each $\mu \in M$, let R'_μ be a ρ-incompressible set such that $0 \in R'_\mu$, $R_\mu \subseteq R'_\mu$ and $max(index[R_\mu]) = max(index[R'_\mu])$. Let $X' = \bigcup_{\mu \in M} R'_\mu$. One easily checks X' has the desired properties.

For part 3, assume $\mu \in M$. Let $Q_1 = \{\chi \in R_\mu \mid h(\mu + \chi) < h(\mu) + \kappa_\alpha\}$ and $Q_2 = R_\mu - Q_1$. Clearly, $Q_1 < Q_2$.

We claim $Q_1 \not\leq^\rho_1 Q_2$. Assume $\chi_i \in Q_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. We will show $\chi_1 \not\leq^\rho \chi_2$. Since this is clear if $\chi_1 = 0$, we may assume $0 < \chi_1$. Therefore,

$$h(\mu) < h(\mu + \chi_1) < h(\mu) + \kappa_\alpha \leq h(\mu + \chi_2)$$

By RTSI, $h(\mu + \chi_1) \not\leq^\rho_1 h(\mu + \chi_2)$. Since h is a ρ-covering, $\mu + \chi_1 \not\leq^\rho_1 \mu + \chi_2$. By RTSI again, $\chi_1 \not\leq^\rho_1 \chi_2$.

By part 8 of Lemma 6.4 of [4], Q_1 is ρ-incompressible. Define $f : Q_1 \to \kappa_\alpha$ by

$$h(\mu + \chi) = h(\mu) + f(\chi)$$

We claim f is a ρ-covering of Q_1. Assume $\chi_1, \chi_2 \in Q_1$ and $\chi_1 <^\rho_k \chi_2$. The assumption implies $0 < \chi_1$. By RTSI, $\mu + \chi_1 \leq^\rho_k \mu + \chi_2$. Since h is a ρ-covering, RTSI implies that $f(\chi_1) \leq^\rho_k f(\chi_2)$.

To prove the conclusion of part 2, assume $\chi \in R_\mu$ and $\chi \in I_\gamma$. If $\chi \in Q_2$ the conclusion of part 2 is clear. So, we may assume $\chi \in Q_1$. Since f is a ρ-covering of Q_1 and Q_1 is ρ-incompressible, $index(f(\chi)) \geq index(\chi) = \gamma$. Therefore, $f(\chi) \geq \kappa_\gamma$. By definition of f, this implies the desired conclusion. □

Lemma 2.3 *Assume λ is a limit ordinal, $\nu < \lambda$ is divisible by κ_α, $X \subseteq \nu$ is a finite ρ-closed set and $\mathcal{Y}$ is a family of nonempty finite ρ-closed subsets of λ such that*

- *$\mathcal{Y}$ is cofinal in λ.*
- *The elements of $\mathcal{Y}$ have the same cardinality.*

- $rem^\rho[Y_1] = rem^\rho[Y_2]$ *for all* $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$.

For $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, *let* M_Y *be the set of* μ *which are divisible by* κ_α *such that* Y *intersects* $[\mu, \mu + \kappa_\alpha)$. *There exists finite* $R \subseteq \kappa_\alpha$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}' \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ *such that*

1. R *is* ρ*-incompressible and* $0 \in R$.
2. $\mathcal{Y}'$ *is cofinal in* λ.
3. *There is a* ρ*-covering of* $X \cup Y$ *into* $X \cup (M_Y + R)$ *for all* $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$.

Proof. Assume $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Let $R_{Y,\mu}$ ($\mu \in M_Y$) be the interval decomposition of Y. Let $R_Y = \bigcup_{\mu \in M_Y} R_{Y,\mu} \cup \{0\}$. Clearly, $Y \subseteq M_Y + R_Y$. Since the elements of M_Y are divisible by κ_α which in turn is divisible by ρ, $rem^\rho[Y] = \bigcup_{\mu \in M_Y} rem^\rho[M_{Y,\mu}]$. Therefore, $rem^\rho[R_Y] = \bigcup_{\mu \in M_Y} rem^\rho[M_{Y,\mu}] \cup \{0\} = rem^\rho[Y] \cup \{0\}$. Since $rem^\rho[Y]$ is fixed as Y varies over $\mathcal{Y}$, so is $rem^\rho[R_Y]$.

Lemma 3.3 of [4] implies there exists $\mathcal{Y}' \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ which is cofinal in λ such that $R_{Y_1} \cong_\rho R_{Y_2}$ for all $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}'$. Moreover, we may assume $\nu \leq Y$ for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$. This implies that $X < M_Y$ for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$. Let R be a ρ-incompressible covering of R_Y for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$. Since R_Y is a subset of κ_α, so is R. Since $0 \in R_Y$, $0 \in R$.

Assume $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$. Part 1 of Lemma 2.2 implies $X \cup (M_Y + R)$ is a covering of $X \cup (M_Y + R_Y)$. This implies there is a covering of $X \cup Y$ into $X \cup (M_Y + R)$. □

3 The Order Reduction Theorem

Recall that we are assuming ρ is an arbitrary additively indecomposable ordinal and α is an epsilon number greater than ρ.

We will see that if $\xi_1 < \xi_2 < \theta_2$ are additively indecomposable then J_{ξ_1} is isomorphic to a proper initial segment of J_{ξ_2}. For the proof, we collapse the $\leq_1^\rho$ connectivity components of each small interval to single points. More precisely, in Definition 3.1 below the interval $\nu_\xi + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + I_\gamma$ is replaced by the single point $\nu_\xi + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\gamma$ when $\gamma < \alpha$ and $\nu_\xi + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\gamma \in J_\xi$. We will see that the resulting structure is essentially isomorphic to an initial segment of $\mathcal{R}_2^\alpha$ and use that result to establish a second recurrence theorem for the length of J_ξ in the following section.

Definition 3.1 *Define $\overline{J}'_\xi$ to be the collection of elements of $\overline{J}_\xi$ which are of the form $\nu_\xi + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\gamma$ where $\gamma < \alpha$. The operation $\iota_{\alpha,\xi}$ is the unique order preserving map of an initial segment of ORD onto $\overline{J}'_\xi$. Define the function $\varphi_\xi : \overline{J}_\xi \to dom(\iota_\xi)$ by*

$$\varphi_\xi(\nu_\xi + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \chi) \;=\; \alpha \cdot \delta + index(\chi)$$

when $\chi < \kappa_\alpha$.

As usual, we should include the parameter ρ in the notation for $\iota_{\alpha,\xi}$ and write $\iota^\rho_{\alpha,\xi}$. Similarly for φ_ξ. Since both ρ and α are clear from the context, we will simply write ι_ξ and φ_ξ.

The following observations will be used often.

- For all ordinals $\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$ in the domain of ι_ξ with $\gamma < \alpha$,

  $$\iota_\xi(\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma) = \nu_\xi + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\gamma$$

  implying

  $$\iota_\xi(\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma) = \iota_\xi(\alpha \cdot \delta) + \kappa_\gamma$$

- If $\sigma \in dom(\iota_\xi)$ is divisible by α then $\iota_\xi(\sigma)$ is divisible by κ_α.

- If $\mu \in \overline{J}_\xi$ is divisible by κ_α then $\mu \in \overline{J}'_\xi$ and $\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)$ is divisible by α.

- ι_ξ is continuous and the domain of ι_ξ has a maximal element if it is bounded.

- φ_ξ is weakly order preserving i.e. if $\sigma, \tau \in \overline{J}_\xi$ and $\sigma \leq \tau$ then $\varphi_\xi(\sigma) \leq \varphi_\xi(\tau)$.

- φ_ξ extends ι_ξ^{-1} and

  $$\varphi_\xi(\mu + \chi) = \iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu) + index(\chi)$$

  whenever $\mu + \chi \in \overline{J}_\xi$, μ is divisible by κ_α and $\chi < \kappa_\alpha$.

- If λ is in the domain of ι_ξ then $\iota_\xi(\lambda)$ is the least σ such that $\varphi_\xi(\sigma) = \lambda$.

- If Z is an α-closed subset of the domain of ι_ξ then $\iota_\xi[Z]$ is κ_α-closed.

- If Z is a κ_α-closed subset of $\overline{J}_\xi$ then $\varphi_\xi[Z]$ is α-closed.

The second observation follows from the continuity of $\gamma \mapsto \kappa_\gamma$.

The following lemma will be the key to the inductive proof of the Order Reduction Theorem.

Lemma 3.2 *Assume $\xi < \theta_2$, $\lambda \in dom(\iota_\xi)$ and*

$$(\star) \qquad \sigma \leq^\alpha_k \tau \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \iota_\xi(\sigma) \leq^\rho_k \iota_\xi(\tau)$$

whenever $1 \leq \sigma \leq \tau \leq \lambda$. Let $J = \varphi_\xi^{-1}[[0, \lambda]]$.

1. *Assume $Z \subseteq J$ is finite, ρ-closed and κ_α-closed with $\nu_\xi \in Z$. Also, suppose $g : \varphi_\xi[Z] \to \lambda$ is an α-covering of $\varphi_\xi[Z]$ with $g(0) = 0$. There exists a ρ-covering $g' : Z \to \iota_\xi(\lambda)$ which is an embedding of Z into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$ such that*

   $$(*) \qquad g'(\mu + \chi) = (\iota_\xi \circ g \circ \iota_\xi^{-1})(\mu) + \chi$$

   whenever $\mu + \chi \in Z$, μ is divisible by κ_α and $\chi < \kappa_\alpha$.

2. *Assume $Z \subseteq [0, \lambda]$ is α-closed and $\iota_\xi(\lambda) \in J_\xi$. Also, suppose $Z^* \subseteq J$ is locally incompressible, $\nu_\xi \in Z^*$, $\iota_\xi[Z] \subseteq Z^*$ and $h : Z^* \to J$ is a ρ-covering of Z^* with $h(\nu_\xi) = \nu_\xi$. There exists an α-covering $h' : Z \to [0, \lambda]$ such that*

   $$(**) \qquad h'(\sigma + \gamma) = (\iota_\xi^{-1} \circ h \circ \iota_\xi)(\sigma) + \gamma$$

   whenever $\sigma + \gamma \in Z$, σ is divisible by α and $\gamma < \alpha$.

3. *Assume $\lambda' \in [1, \lambda]$. $\lambda' \leq^\alpha_1 \lambda + 1$ iff $\lambda + 1$ is in the domain of ι_ξ and $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq^\rho_1 \iota_\xi(\lambda + 1)$.*

Proof. Notice that J is an initial segment of $\overline{J}_\xi$. Let $\tilde{\delta}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ be ordinals such that $\lambda = \alpha \cdot \tilde{\delta} + \tilde{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\gamma} < \alpha$. By part 13 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $J = [\nu_\xi, \nu_\xi + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \tilde{\delta} + \kappa_{\tilde{\gamma}+1})$.

(Part 1) By Lemma 2.4 of [4], in order to show that $(*)$ defines an embedding of Z into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$, it suffices to show that if $\mu \in Z$ is divisible by κ_α then $g'(\mu)$ is defined and divisible by κ_α.

Assume $\mu \in Z$ is divisible by κ_α. Our assumption implies $\mu \in \overline{J}'_\xi$. Therefore, μ is in the domain of ι_ξ^{-1}. Since μ is divisible by κ_α, $\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)$ is divisible by α. Moreover, $\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu) = \varphi_\xi(\mu)$ implying $\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)$ is in the domain of g. Since

$\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)$ is divisible by α and g is an α-covering, $g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu))$ is divisible by α. Therefore, $g'(\mu) = \iota_\xi(g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)))$ is divisible by κ_α.

Since ρ divides κ_α, Z is ρ-closed and g' is an embedding of Z into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$, g' is clearly an embedding of Z into $\mathcal{R}^\rho$.

To show that the range of g' is contained in $\iota_\xi(\lambda)$, assume $\mu+\chi \in Z$ where μ is divisible by κ_α and $\chi < \kappa_\alpha$. To establish $g'(\mu+\chi) < \iota_\xi(\lambda)$, it suffices to show $\varphi_\xi(g'(\mu+\chi)) < \lambda$. Let $\gamma = index(\chi)$. Since $\varphi_\xi(\mu+\chi) = \iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)+\gamma$, $\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)+\gamma$ is in the domain of g.

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \varphi_\xi(g'(\mu+\chi)) & = & \varphi_\xi(g'(\mu)+\chi)) & \text{(by } (*)\text{)} \\ & = & \iota_\xi^{-1}(g'(\mu))+\gamma & \text{(since } g'(\mu) \text{ is divisible by } \kappa_\alpha\text{)} \\ & = & g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu))+\gamma & \text{(by } (*)\text{)} \\ & = & g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)+\gamma) & \text{(since } \iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu) \text{ is divisible by } \alpha\text{)} \\ & < & \lambda & \text{(since } ran(g) \subseteq \lambda\text{)} \end{array}$$

To complete the proof that g' is a ρ-covering of Z, assume $\mu_i + \chi_i \in Z$ where μ_i is divisible by κ_α and $\chi_i < \kappa_\alpha$ for $i = 1, 2$ and

$$\mu_1 + \chi_1 <_k^\rho \mu_2 + \chi_2$$

We will show $g'(\mu_1+\chi_1) \leq_k^\rho g'(\mu_2+\chi_2)$. Since Z is κ_α-closed, $\mu_i \in Z$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Since g' is an embedding of Z into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$, $g'(\mu_i)$ is divisible by κ_α for $i = 1, 2$.

Case 1 of Part 1. Assume $\mu_1 + \chi_1 = \nu_\xi$.

Since $g(0) = 0$, one easily checks $g'(\nu_\xi) = \nu_\xi$. So, we need to show $\nu_\xi \leq_k^\rho g'(\mu_2+\chi_2)$. When $k = 1$ this follows from the fact that $\nu_\xi \leq_1^\rho \beta$ for all $\beta \in \overline{J_\xi}$. Suppose $k = 2$. Since $\nu_\xi \leq_2^\rho \mu_2+\chi_2$, RTSI implies $\chi_2 = 0$. Since g' is an embedding of Z into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$, $g'(\mu_2)$ is divisible by κ_α. Since $g'(\mu_2) < \iota_\xi(\lambda)$, $g'(\mu_2) \in J_\xi$. This implies that $\nu_\xi \leq_2^\rho \mu_2$.

Case 2 of Part 1. Assume $\mu_1 + \chi_1 \neq \nu_\xi$, $\chi_1 = 0$ and $\chi_2 \neq 0$.

By RTSI, we must have $k = 1$. Let $\gamma = index(\chi_2)$. Since $\mu_1 \leq_1^\rho \mu_2 + \chi_2$ and $\kappa_\gamma \leq \chi_2$,

$$\mu_1 \leq_1^\rho \mu_2 + \kappa_\gamma$$

Since $\nu_\xi < \mu_1 < \mu_2 + \chi_2$, the assumptions of the lemma imply

$$\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_1) \leq_1^\alpha \iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_2+\kappa_\gamma) = \iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_2)+\gamma$$

and $0 < \iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_1)$. Since $\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_1) = \varphi_\xi(\mu_1) \in \varphi_\xi[Z]$, $\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_2)+\gamma = \varphi_\xi(\mu_2+\chi_2) \in \varphi_\xi[Z]$, g is an α-covering of $\varphi_\xi[Z]$ and α divides $\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_2)$,

$$g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_1)) \leq_1^\alpha g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_2)+\gamma) = g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_2))+\gamma$$

Since $0 < \iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_1)$, $0 = g(0) < g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_1))$. The assumptions of the lemma imply

$$\iota_\xi(g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_1))) \leq_1^\alpha \iota_\xi(g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_2)) + \gamma) = \iota_\xi(g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_2))) + \kappa_\gamma$$

where the equality follows from the fact that $g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu_2))$ is divisible by α. By the definition of g',

$$g'(\mu_1) \leq_1^\rho g'(\mu_2) + \kappa_\gamma$$

Since $index(\chi_2) = \gamma$, $\kappa_\gamma \leq_1^\rho \chi_2$. RTSI impies

$$g'(\mu_2) + \kappa_\gamma \leq_1^\rho g'(\mu_2) + \chi_2$$

Therefore,

$$g'(\mu_1) \leq_1^\rho g'(\mu_2) + \chi_2 = g'(\mu_2 + \chi_2)$$

Case 3 of Part 1. Assume $\mu_1 + \chi_1 \neq \nu_\xi$ and $\chi_1 = \chi_2 = 0$.

The assumptions of the lemma and the assumption that g is an α-covering easily imply that $g'(\mu_1) \leq_k^\rho g'(\mu_2)$.

Case 4 of Part 1. Assume $\chi_1 \neq 0$.

By RTSI, $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ and $\chi_1 \leq_k^\rho \chi_2$. RTSI also implies $g'(\mu_1) + \chi_1 \leq_k^\rho g'(\mu_1) + \chi_2$ i.e. $g'(\mu_1 + \chi_1) \leq_k^\rho g'(\mu_2 + \chi_2)$.

(Part 2) Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda) \in J_\xi$, part 13 of Lemma 8.6 of [4] implies that $J \subseteq J_\xi$.

By parts 9 and 10 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], an element μ of J_ξ is divisible by κ_α iff $\nu_\xi \leq_2^\rho \mu$. Since $\nu_\xi \in Z^*$ and h fixes ν_ξ, $h(\mu)$ is divisible by κ_α whenever $\mu \in Z^*$ is divisible by κ_α.

By Lemma 2.4 of [4], in order to show that $(**)$ defines an embedding of Z into $\mathcal{R}^\alpha$, it suffices to show that if $\sigma \in Z$ is divisible by α then $h'(\sigma)$ is defined and divisible by α.

Assume $\sigma \in Z$ is divisible by α. Our assumption implies $\iota_\xi(\sigma)$ is divisible by κ_α. Moreover, the assumptions of part 2 imply $\iota_\xi(\sigma)$ is in the domain of h. By the remark above, $h(\iota_\xi(\sigma))$ is divisible by κ_α. This implies that $h(\iota_\xi(\sigma)) \in \overline{J}'_\xi$ and $h'(\sigma) = \iota_\xi^{-1}(h(\iota_\xi(\sigma)))$ is divisible by α.

Claim for Part 2. If $\sigma + \gamma \in Z$ where σ is divisible by α and $\gamma < \alpha$ then $h'(\sigma + \gamma) \leq \varphi_\xi(h(\iota_\xi(\sigma + \gamma)))$.

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \varphi_\xi(h(\iota_\xi(\sigma + \gamma))) & = & \varphi_\xi(h(\iota_\xi(\sigma) + \kappa_\gamma)) & \text{(remarks before the lemma)} \\ & \geq & \varphi_\xi(h(\iota_\xi(\sigma)) + \kappa_\gamma) & \text{(part 3 of Lemma 2.2)} \end{array}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \iota_\xi^{-1}(h(\iota_\xi(\sigma))) + \gamma && (h(\iota_\xi(\sigma)) \text{ is divisible by } \kappa_\alpha)\\
&= h'(\sigma) + \gamma\\
&= h'(\sigma + \gamma)
\end{aligned}
$$

To see that the range of h' is contained in $[0, \lambda]$, assume $\sigma + \gamma \in Z$ where σ is divisible by α and $\gamma < \alpha$. By the assumptions for part 2, $\iota_\xi(\sigma + \gamma) \in Z^*$ and $h(\iota_\xi(\sigma + \gamma)) \in J$. By definition of J, $\varphi_\xi(h(\iota_\xi(\sigma + \gamma))) \in [0, \lambda]$. This and the claim imply $h'(\sigma + \gamma) \leq \lambda$.

To complete the proof of part 2, assume $\sigma_i + \gamma_i \in Z$ where σ_i is divisible by α and $\gamma_i < \alpha$ for $i = 1, 2$ and

$$\sigma_1 + \gamma_1 <_k^\alpha \sigma_2 + \gamma_2$$

We will show $h'(\sigma_1 + \gamma_1) \leq_k^\alpha h'(\sigma_2 + \gamma_2)$. Our assumption implies that $\gamma_1 = 0$ and $\sigma_1 \neq 0$.

Case 1 of Part 2. Assume $\gamma_2 \neq 0$.

By RTSI, $k = 1$. By the assumptions of the lemma,

$$\iota_\xi(\sigma_1) \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\sigma_2 + \gamma_2) = \iota_\xi(\sigma_2) + \kappa_{\gamma_2}$$

Since h is a ρ-covering,

$$h(\iota_\xi(\sigma_1)) \leq_1^\rho h(\iota_\xi(\sigma_2) + \kappa_{\gamma_2})$$

By part 3 of Lemma 2.2, $h(\iota_\xi(\sigma_2)) + \kappa_{\gamma_2} \leq h(\iota_\xi(\sigma_2) + \kappa_{\gamma_2})$. Therefore,

$$h(\iota_\xi(\sigma_1)) \leq_1^\rho h(\iota_\xi(\sigma_2)) + \kappa_{\gamma_2}$$

Since $\sigma_1 \neq 0$, $\nu_\xi = \iota_\xi(0) < \iota_\xi(\sigma_1)$ implying $0 \leq h(\nu_\xi) < h(\iota_\xi(\sigma_1))$. Since $h(\iota_\xi(\sigma_2)) + \kappa_{\gamma_2}$ is in the domain of ι_ξ^{-1}, this implies

$$h'(\sigma_1) \leq_1^\alpha h'(\sigma_2 + \gamma_2)$$

by the assumptions of the lemma and the definition of h'.

Case 2 of Part 2. Assume $\gamma_2 = 0$.

The assumptions the lemma and the assumption that h is a ρ-covering easily imply the desired conclusion.

(Part 3)

($\Rightarrow$) Assume $\lambda' \leq_1^\alpha \lambda + 1$. Recall that $\lambda = \alpha \cdot \tilde{\delta} + \tilde{\gamma}$ where $\tilde{\gamma} < \alpha$ and $J = [\nu_\xi, \tau)$ where $\tau = \nu_\xi + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \tilde{\delta} + \kappa_{\tilde{\gamma}+1}$. Notice that if $\lambda + 1$ were in the

domain of ι_ξ then $\iota_\xi(\lambda+1)=\tau$. By Lemma 3.1 of [4], λ' is a limit multiple of α implying $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ is a limit multiple of κ_α.

Claim for ($\Rightarrow$) of part 3. Assume $X \subseteq \iota_\xi(\lambda')$ and $Y \subseteq [\iota_\xi(\lambda'),\tau)$ are finite sets which are both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed. There exists a ρ-covering of $X \cup Y$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ which fixes X and is an embedding of $X \cup Y$ into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$.

Let X_0 be the set whose elements are ν_ξ along with the set of all $\mu \in X$ such that $\mu \leq_2^\rho \mu'$ for some $\mu' \in Y$. By Lemma 3.9 of [4], it suffices to find a ρ-covering of $X_0 \cup Y$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ which is an embedding of $X_0 \cup Y$ into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$, fixes X_0 and maps Y above X (clearly, the extension of such a ρ-covering of $X_0 \cup Y$ to $X \cup Y$ which fixes the elements of X will still be an embedding into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$).

By part 4 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $\nu_\xi \leq X_0$. By RTSI, each element of X_0 is divisible by κ_α implying X_0 is both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed.

Since X_0 and Y are both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed, $X_0 \cup Y$ is both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed. By the remarks preceding the previous lemma, $\varphi_\xi[X_0]$ and $\varphi_\xi[Y]$ are α-closed.

If $\beta \in X \cap \overline{J}_\xi$ then, since $\beta < \iota_\xi(\lambda')$, $\varphi_\xi(\beta) < \lambda'$. Since $\lambda' \leq_1^\alpha \lambda$, there is an α-covering g of $\varphi_\xi[X_0] \cup \varphi_\xi[Y]$ into λ' which fixes $\varphi_\xi[X_0]$ and maps $\varphi_\xi[Y]$ above $\varphi_\xi(\beta)$ for all $\beta \in X \cap \overline{J}_\xi$. Since $\nu_\xi \in X_0$, $0 \in \varphi_\xi[X_0]$ and $g(0)=0$. By part 1, there is a ρ-covering $g' : X_0 \cup Y \to \iota_\xi(\lambda)$ which is an embedding of $X_0 \cup Y$ into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$ such that $g'(\mu+\chi) = (\iota_\xi \circ g \circ \iota_\xi^{-1})(\mu)+\chi$ whenever $\mu+\chi \in X_0 \cup Y$, μ is divisible by κ_α and $\chi < \kappa_\alpha$.

To see that g' fixes the elements of X_0, suppose $\mu+\chi \in X_0$ where μ is divisible by κ_α and $\chi < \kappa_\alpha$. Since all elements of X_0 are divisible by κ_α, $\chi = 0$. Since g fixes elements of $\varphi_\xi[X_0] = \iota_\xi^{-1}[X_0]$, g' clearly fixes μ.

To see that g' maps Y above X, it is enough to show g' maps Y above $X \cap \overline{J}_\xi$. Suppose $\beta \in X \cap \overline{J}_\xi$ and $\mu+\chi \in Y$ where μ is divisible by κ_α and $\chi < \kappa_\alpha$. To show $\beta < g'(\mu+\chi)$, it suffices to show $\beta < g'(\mu)$. Since $g'(\mu) = \iota_\xi(g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)))$, it suffices to have $\varphi_\xi(\beta) < g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu))$. Since $\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu) = \varphi_\xi(\mu)$ (by one of the the observations before the lemma), this follows from the choice of g.

To see that g' maps Y into $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$, assume $\mu+\chi \in Y$ where μ is divisible by κ_α and $\chi < \kappa_\alpha$. We will show $g'(\mu+\chi) < \iota_\xi(\lambda')$. Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ is a multiple of κ_α and $g'(\mu+\chi) = g'(\mu)+\chi$, it suffices to show $g'(\mu) < \iota_\xi(\lambda')$. Since $g'(\mu) = \iota_\xi(g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)))$, this follows from the fact that $g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)) < \lambda'$.

This completes the proof of the claim.

To show that $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq_1^\rho \tau$, assume $X \subseteq \iota_\xi(\lambda')$ and $Y \subseteq [\iota_\xi(\lambda'),\tau)$ are finite

ρ-closed sets. We will show there is a ρ-covering of $X \cup Y$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ which fixes X.

Let X^+ be the union of X with the collection of μ which are divisible by κ_α such that X intersects $[\mu, \mu + \kappa_\alpha)$. Since κ_α is divisible by ρ, X^+ is both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed. Clearly, $X^+ \subseteq \iota_\xi(\lambda')$. Similarly, let Y^+ be the union of Y with the collection of μ which are divisible by κ_α such that Y intersects $[\mu, \mu + \kappa_\alpha)$. As with X^+, Y^+ is both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed.

By the claim, there is a ρ-covering of $X^+ \cup Y^+$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ which fixes X^+. The restriction to $X \cup Y$ is the desired ρ-covering of $X \cup Y$.

We still need to show $\lambda + 1$ is in the domain of ι_ξ. For this, it suffices to show $\tau \in \overline{J}_\xi$.

First consider the case when $\xi + 1 = \theta_2$. Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq_1^\rho \tau$ and $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \in I_\alpha$, $\tau \in I_\alpha$ implying $\tau \in J_\xi = \overline{J}_\xi$.

Suppose $\xi + 1 < \theta_2$. In this case, $\overline{J}_\xi = [\nu_\xi, \nu_{\xi+1}]$. Argue by contradiction and assume that $\tau \notin \overline{J}_\xi$. This implies $\nu_{\xi+1} < \tau$. We will derive a contradiction by showing this implies $\nu_\xi \leq_2^\rho \nu_{\xi+1}$.

By part 14 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $\nu_\xi \leq_2^{\rho\uparrow} \nu_{\xi+1}$.

To show $\nu_\xi \leq_2^{\rho\downarrow}$, assume $X \subseteq \nu_\xi$ and $Y \subseteq [\nu_\xi, \nu_{\xi+1})$ are finite ρ-closed sets. We will show there is a ρ-covering h of $X \cup Y$ into ν_ξ which fixes X such that $h(\zeta) \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi$ whenever $\zeta \in Y$ and $\zeta \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\xi+1}$. As above, there exists finite $X^+ \subseteq \nu_\xi$ containing X which is both ρ-close and κ_α-closed, and there exists finite $Y^+ \subseteq [\nu_\xi, \nu_{\xi+1})$ containing Y which is both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed. We may assume $\nu_\xi \in Y^+$. Let $Y_1 = Y^+ \cap [\nu_\xi, \iota_\xi(\lambda'))$ and $Y_2 = Y^+ \cap [\iota_\xi(\lambda'), \nu_{\xi+1})$. Clearly, Y_1 and Y_2 are both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed. By the claim, there is a ρ-covering h_1 of $X^+ \cup Y_1 \cup Y_2 \cup \{\nu_{\xi+1}\}$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ which is an embedding into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$ and fixes $X^+ \cup Y_1$. Since h_1 is an embedding into $\mathcal{R}^{\kappa_\alpha}$, $h_1(\nu_{\xi+1})$ is divisible by κ_α. Moreover, $\nu_\xi = h_1(\nu_\xi) < h_1(\nu_{\xi+1}) < \iota_\xi(\lambda') < \iota_\xi(\lambda) \leq \nu_{\xi+1}$. Therefore, $\nu_\xi \leq_2^\rho h_1(\nu_{\xi+1})$. This implies there is a ρ-covering h_2 of $X^+ \cup Y_1 \cup h_1[Y_2]$ into ν_ξ which fixes X^+ such that $h_2(\zeta) \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi$ whenever $\zeta \in Y_1 \cup h_1[Y_2]$ and $\zeta \leq_1^\rho h_1(\nu_{\xi+1})$. The composition of h_1 and h_2 restricted to $X \cup Y$ is the desired ρ-covering h.

We have established that $\nu_\xi \leq_2^\rho \nu_{\xi+1}$ – contradiction.

($\Leftarrow$) Assume $\lambda + 1$ is in the domain of ι_ξ and $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda + 1)$.

To show $\lambda' \leq_1^\alpha \lambda + 1$, assume $X \subseteq \lambda'$ and $Y \subseteq [\lambda', \lambda]$ are finite α-closed sets. We will show there is an α-covering of $X \cup Y$ into λ' which fixes X.

Let X_0 consist of 0 along with those σ in X such that $\sigma \leq_2^\alpha \sigma'$ for some $\sigma' \in Y$. By Lemma 3.9 of [4], it suffices to find a covering of $X_0 \cup Y$ into λ'

which fixes X_0 and maps the elements of Y above X.

By Lemma 3.1 of [4], each element of X_0 is a multiple of α. Therefore, each element of $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ is a multiple of κ_α. This implies that $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ is locally incompressible. Since $0 \in X_0$, $\nu_\xi = \iota_\xi(0) \in \iota_\xi[X_0]$.

By part 2 of Lemma 2.2, there is a finite subset Y^* of $[\iota_\xi(\lambda'), \iota_\xi(\lambda+1))$ which is locally incompressible such that $\iota_\xi[Y] \subseteq Y^*$. Since both $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ and Y^* are locally incompressible, $\iota_\xi[X_0] \cup Y^*$ is locally incompressible.

Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda+1)$, there is a ρ-covering h of $\iota_\xi[X_0] \cup Y^*$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ which fixes $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ and maps Y^* above $\iota_\xi(\zeta)$ for each $\zeta \in X$. By part 2, there is an α-covering h' of $X_0 \cup Y$ into $[0,\lambda]$ such that $h'(\sigma+\gamma) = (\iota_\xi^{-1} \circ h \circ \iota_\xi)(\sigma)+\gamma$ whenever $\sigma+\gamma \in X_0 \cup Y$, σ is divisible by α and $\gamma < \alpha$.

To see that h' fixes X_0, assume $\sigma+\gamma \in X_0$ where σ is divisible by α and $\gamma < \alpha$. Since each element of X_0 is a multiple of α, $\gamma = 0$. Since $\iota_\xi(\sigma) \in \iota_\xi[X_0]$ and $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ is fixed by h, σ is fixed by h'.

To see that h' maps Y above X, assume $\zeta \in X$ and $\sigma+\gamma \in Y$ where σ is divisible by α and $\gamma < \alpha$. Since $\sigma \in Y$, it suffices to show $\zeta < h'(\sigma)$. Since $\iota_\xi(\sigma) \in Y^*$, $\iota_\xi(\zeta) < h(\iota_\xi(\sigma))$ by choice of h. Applying ι_ξ^{-1}, $\zeta < \iota_\xi^{-1}(h(\iota_\xi(\sigma))) = h'(\sigma)$.

To see that h' maps Y into λ', assume $\sigma+\gamma \in Y$ where σ is divisible by α and $\gamma < \alpha$. Since λ' is divisible by κ_α and $h'(\sigma+\gamma) = h'(\sigma)+\gamma$, to show $h'(\sigma+\gamma) < \lambda'$ it suffices to establish that $h'(\sigma) < \lambda'$. This follows from the definition of h' and the fact that $h(\iota_\xi(\sigma)) < \iota_\xi(\lambda')$. □

Theorem 3.3 (Order Reduction Theorem) *Assume $\xi < \theta_2$. If $1 \leq \lambda' < \lambda \in dom(\iota_\xi)$ then*

$$(\star) \qquad \lambda' \leq_k^\alpha \lambda \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq_k^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda)$$

for $k = 1, 2$.

Proof. Let K be the collection of ordinals λ in the domain of ι_ξ such that for $k = 1, 2$ and all $\lambda' \in [1, \lambda)$, $(\star)$ holds. We will show that $K = dom(\iota_\xi)$ by induction.

Assume $\lambda \in dom(\iota_\xi)$ and $\lambda' \in K$ for all $\lambda' < \lambda$.

First, suppose $k = 1$ and assume $\lambda' \in [1, \lambda)$. If λ is a limit ordinal then $(\star)$ follows from the induction hypothesis using the continuity of ι_ξ and part 2 of Lemma 3.8 of [4]. On the other hand, if λ is a successor ordinal then $(\star)$ follows from part 3 of Lemma 3.2.

We now consider the case $k = 2$. Assume $\lambda' \in [1, \lambda)$.

($\Rightarrow$) Assume $\lambda' \leq_2^\alpha \lambda$.

By Lemma 3.1 of [4] and part 1 of Lemma 3.6 of [4], both λ' and λ are limit multiples of α. Therefore, both $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ and $\iota_\xi(\lambda)$ are limit multiples of κ_α.

We first show that $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq_2^\rho\downarrow \iota_\xi(\lambda)$. The proof is similar to the forward direction of part 3 of Lemma 3.2.

Assume $X \subseteq \iota_\xi(\lambda')$ and $Y \subseteq [\iota_\xi(\lambda'), \iota_\xi(\lambda))$ are finite ρ-closed sets. Let X_0 be the set whose elements are ν_ξ along with all $\mu \in X$ such that $\mu \leq_2^\rho \mu'$ for some $\mu' \in Y$. By Lemma 3.9 of [4], it suffices to find a ρ-covering f of $X_0 \cup Y$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ which fixes X_0 and maps Y above X such that $f(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda')$ whenever $\mu \in Y$ and $\mu \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda)$.

By part 4 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $\nu_\xi \leq X_0$. By RTSI, each element of X_0 is divisible by κ_α implying X_0 is both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed.

Let Y^+ be the union of Y with the collection of μ which are divisible by κ_α such that Y intersects $[\mu, \mu + \kappa_\alpha)$. Since κ_α is divisible by ρ, Y^+ is both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed. Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ is divisible by κ_α, $Y^+ \subseteq [\iota_\xi(\lambda'), \iota_\xi(\lambda))$.

Without loss of generality, we may replace Y by Y^+

Since $\lambda' \leq_2^\alpha \lambda$, there is a covering g of $\varphi_\xi[X_0] \cup \varphi_\xi[Y^+]$ into λ' such that g fixes $\varphi_\xi[X_0]$, $\varphi_\xi(\beta) < g[\varphi_\xi[Y^+]]$ for each $\beta \in X \cap \overline{J}_\xi$ and $g(\sigma) \leq_1^\alpha \lambda'$ whenever $\sigma \in \varphi_\xi[Y]$ and $\sigma \leq_1^\alpha \lambda$.

Since $\nu_\xi \in X_0$, $0 = \varphi_\xi(\nu_\xi) \in \varphi_\xi[X_0]$ and $g(0) = 0$.

By part 1 of Lemma 3.2, there is a ρ-covering g' of $X_0 \cup Y^+$ such that $g'(\mu + \chi) = (\iota_\xi^{-1} \circ g \circ \iota_x i)(\mu) + \chi$ whenever $\mu + \chi \in X_0 \cup Y^+$, μ is divisible by κ_α and $\chi < \kappa_\alpha$.

By a straightforward argument similar to that in the forward direction of part 3 of Lemma 3.2, g' maps $X_0 \cup Y^+$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$, fixes X and maps Y above X.

Suppose $\mu \in Y^+$ and $\mu \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda)$. Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda)$ is a multiple of κ_α, μ must be a multiple of κ_α by RTSI. Therefore, μ is in the range of ι_ξ and, by the case $k = 1$, $\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu) \leq_1^\alpha \lambda$. Therefore, $g(\iota_\xi^{-1}(\mu)) \leq_1^\alpha \lambda'$ implying $g'(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda')$ by the induction hypothesis.

The restriction of g' to $X_0 \cup Y$ is the desired ρ-covering f.

We now show $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq_2^\rho\uparrow \iota_\xi(\lambda)$.

Assume X is a finite ρ-closed subset of $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ is a collection of finite ρ-closed sets which is cofinal in $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ such that $X < Y$ for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $X \cup Y_1 \cong_\rho X \cup Y_2$ for all $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$. Also, suppose $\beta < \iota_\xi(\lambda)$. We will show there is $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and a covering of $X \cup Y$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda)$ which fixes X and maps

Y above β. This suffices by Lemma 3.4 of [4].

Since λ is a limit multiple of α and ι_ξ is continuous, we may assume there is $\beta' < \lambda$ which is a multiple of α such that $\beta = \iota_\xi(\beta')$. Moreover, we may assume $\lambda' < \beta'$. Our assumptions imply β is a multiple of κ_α.

Let X_0 be the set whose elements are ν_ξ along with those $\mu \in X$ such that for each $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ there exists $\mu' \in Y$ such that $\mu \leq_2^\rho \mu'$. As before, $\nu_\xi \leq X_0$. Also, each element of X_0 is divisible by κ_α implying X_0 is locally incompressible. In particular, X_0 is both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed.

Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ is a limit multiple of κ_α, there is $\nu < \iota_\xi(\lambda')$ which is a multiple of κ_α such that $X_0 < \nu$. We may assume $\nu \leq Y$ for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

By Lemma 3.10 of [4], it suffices to show that there exists $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and a covering of $X_0 \cup Y$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda)$ which fixes X_0 and maps Y above β.

For $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, let M_Y be the set of μ such that μ is divisible by κ_α and Y intersects $[\mu, \mu + \kappa_\alpha)$.

Since $X \cup Y_1 \cong_\rho X \cup Y_2$ for $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$, $rem^\rho[Y]$ and $card(Y)$ are constant as Y varies over $\mathcal{Y}$. By Lemma 2.3 there is a ρ-incompressible subset R of κ_α and $\mathcal{Y}' \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ such that $0 \in R$, $\mathcal{Y}'$ is cofinal in $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$, and there is a ρ-covering of $X_0 \cup Y$ into $X_0 \cup (M_Y + R)$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$.

Since $0 \in R$, $M_Y + R$ is locally incompressible for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$. In particular, $M_Y + R$ is both ρ-closed and κ_α-closed for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$.

Assume $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$. Since X_0 and $M_Y + R$ are κ_α-closed, $\varphi_\xi[X_0] \cup \varphi_\xi[M_Y + R]$ is α-closed. Moreover, $\varphi_\xi[M_Y + R] = \varphi_\xi[M_Y] + index[R] = \iota_\xi^{-1}[M_Y] + index[R]$ implying $rem^\alpha[\varphi_\xi[M_Y + R]] = index[R]$.

Since $rem^\alpha[\varphi_\xi[M_Y + R]]$ is fixed as Y ranges over $\mathcal{Y}'$, Lemma 3.3 of [4] implies there is a subcollection $\mathcal{Y}''$ of $\mathcal{Y}'$ which is cofinal in $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ such that $\varphi_\xi[X_0] \cup \varphi_\xi[M_{Y_1} + R] \cong_\alpha \varphi_\xi[X_0] \cup \varphi_\xi[M_{Y_2} + R]$ for all $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}''$.

Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ is a limit multiple of κ_α and $\mathcal{Y}''$ is cofinal in $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$, we clearly have that M_Y $(Y \in \mathcal{Y}'')$ is cofinal in $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$. This implies that $\varphi_\xi[M_Y + R]$ $(Y \in \mathcal{Y}'')$ is cofinal in λ'.

Assume $Y \in \mathcal{Y}''$. Since $\lambda' \leq_2^\alpha \lambda$, there is an α-covering g of $\varphi_\xi[X_0] \cup \varphi_\xi[M_Y + R]$ into λ which fixes $\varphi_\xi[X_0]$ such that $\beta' < g[\varphi_\xi[M_Y + R]]$. Since $\nu_\xi \in X_0$, $0 = \varphi_\xi(\nu_\xi) \in \varphi_\xi[X_0]$. Therefore, $g(0) = 0$. By part 1 of Lemma 3.2, there is a ρ-covering g' of $X_0 \cup (M_Y + R)$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda)$ such that $g'(\mu + \chi) = (\iota_\xi \circ g \circ \iota_\xi^{-1})(\mu) + \chi$ whenever $\mu + \chi \in X_0 \cup (M_Y + R)$, μ is divisible by κ_α and $\chi < \kappa_\alpha$.

A straightforward argument shows g' fixes each element of X_0, being divisible by κ_α, and g' maps each element of M_Y, hence of $M_Y + R$, above $\iota_\xi(\beta')$.

($\Leftarrow$) Assume $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq_2^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda)$. By the case $k = 1$, $\lambda' \leq_1^\alpha \lambda$. By Lemma 3.1 of [4], λ' is a limit multiple of α implying $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ is a limit multiple of κ_α. By RTSI, $\iota_\xi(\lambda)$ is a multiple of κ_α implying λ is a multiple of α.

We first show $\lambda' \leq_2^{\alpha\downarrow} \lambda$. The proof is similar to that of the reverse direction of part 3 of Lemma 3.2.

Assume $X \subseteq \lambda'$ and $Y \subseteq [\lambda', \lambda)$ are finite α-closed sets. We will show there is an α-covering h' of $X \cup Y$ in λ' which fixes X such that $h'(\sigma) \leq_1^\alpha \lambda'$ whenever $\sigma \in Y$ and $\sigma \leq_1^\alpha \lambda$.

Let X_0 be the set whose elements are 0 along with those σ in X such that $\sigma \leq_2^\alpha \sigma'$ for some $\sigma' \in Y$. By Lemma 3.9 of [4], it suffices to find a covering h' of $X_0 \cup Y$ into λ' which fixes X_0 and maps the elements of Y above X such that $h'(\sigma) \leq_1^\alpha \lambda'$ whenever $\sigma \in Y$ and $\sigma \leq_1^\alpha \lambda$.

By Lemma 3.1 of [4], each element of X_0 is a multiple of α. Therefore, each element of $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ is a multiple of κ_α. This implies that $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ is locally incompressible. Since $0 \in X_0$, $\nu_\xi = \iota_\xi(0) \in \iota_\xi[X_0]$.

By part 2 of Lemma 2.2, there is a finite subset Y^* of $[\iota_\xi(\lambda'), \iota_\xi(\lambda))$ which is locally incompressible such that $\iota_\xi[Y] \subseteq Y^*$. Since both $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ and Y^* are locally incompressible, $\iota_\xi[X_0] \cup Y^*$ is locally incompressible.

Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq_2^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda)$, there is a ρ-covering h of $\iota_\xi[X_0] \cup Y^*$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ which fixes $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ and maps Y^* above $\iota_\xi(\zeta)$ for each $\zeta \in X$ such that $h(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda')$ whenever $\mu \in Y^*$ and $\mu \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda)$. By part 2 of Lemma 3.2, there is an α-covering h' of $X_0 \cup Y$ into λ such that $h'(\sigma + \gamma) = (\iota_\xi^{-1} \circ h \circ \iota_\xi)(\sigma) + \gamma$ whenever $\sigma + \gamma \in X_0 \cup Y$, σ is divisible by α and $\gamma < \alpha$.

As in the proof of the reverse direction of part 3 of Lemma 3.2, h' is a covering of $X_0 \cup Y$ into λ' which fixes X_0 and maps Y above X.

Assume $\sigma \in Y$ and $\sigma \leq_1^\alpha \lambda$. By the case $k = 1$, $\iota_\xi(\sigma) \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda)$ implying $h(\iota_\xi(\sigma)) \leq_1^\rho \iota_\xi(\lambda')$. By the induction hypothesis and the definition of h', $h'(\sigma) \leq_1^\alpha \lambda'$.

We now show that $\lambda' \leq_2^{\alpha\uparrow} \lambda$.

Assume X is a finite α-closed subset of λ' and $\mathcal{Y}$ is a collection of nonempty finite α-closed subsets of λ' which is cofinal in λ' such that $X < Y$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $X \cup Y_1 \cong_\alpha X \cup Y_2$ whenever $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$. Also, suppose that $\beta < \lambda$. We will show that there is $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and an α-covering of $X \cup Y$ into λ which fixes X and maps Y above β. We may assume that $\lambda' \leq \beta$.

Let X_0 be the set whose elements are 0 along with those $\sigma \in X$ such that for each $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ there exists $\sigma' \in Y$ such that $\sigma \leq_\rho^\alpha \sigma'$. By Lemma 3.1 of [4], each element of X_0 is a multiple of α. Therefore, each element of

$\iota_\xi[X_0]$ is divisible by κ_α implying that $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ is locally incompressible. Also, $\nu_\xi = \iota_\xi(0) \in \iota_\xi[X_0]$.

By Lemma 3.10 of [4], it suffices to show that there exists $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and a covering of $X_0 \cup Y$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda)$ which fixes X_0 and maps Y above β.

Since $X \cup Y_1 \cong_\alpha X \cup Y_2$ for all $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$, $rem^\alpha[Y_1] = rem^\alpha[Y_2]$ for all $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$. Let R be the common value of $rem^\alpha[Y]$ as Y ranges of $\mathcal{Y}$. Since each element of $\mathcal{Y}$ is α-closed, $0 \in R$.

Assume $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Let M_Y consist of the elements of Y which are divisible by α. Since Y is α-closed, $Y \subseteq M_Y + R$. Since $0 \in R$, $M_Y + R$ is α-closed.

Notice that $\iota_\xi[M_Y + R] = \iota_\xi[M_Y] + \{\kappa_\gamma \,|\, \gamma \in R\}$ and the elements of $\iota_\xi[M_Y]$ are divisible by κ_α for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Since $0 \in R$, $0 = \kappa_0 \in \{\kappa_\gamma \,|\, \gamma \in R\}$.

By Lemma 6.7 of [4], there is a ρ-incompressible set R^* which contains $\{\kappa_\gamma \,|\, \gamma \in R\}$ such that $index(max(R^*))$ is the largest element of R. Since $0 \in \{\kappa_\gamma \,|\, \gamma \in R\}$, $0 \in R^*$.

Assume $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. By choice of R^*, $\iota_\xi[M_Y + R] \subseteq \iota_\xi[M_Y] + R^*$. Since the elements of $\iota_\xi[M_Y]$ are divisible by κ_α and $0 \in R^*$, $\iota_\xi[M_Y] + R^*$ is locally incompressible. Since both $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ and $\iota_\xi[M_Y] + R^*$ are locally incompressible, $\iota_\xi[X_0] \cup (\iota_\xi[M_Y] + R^*)$ is locally incompressible. Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$ is divisible by κ_α and $M_Y < \lambda'$, $\iota_\xi[M_Y] + R^* < \iota_\xi(\lambda')$. Using the fact that the elements of $\iota_\xi[M_Y]$ are divisible by κ_α again, $rem^\rho[\iota_\xi[M_Y] + R^*] = rem^\rho[R^*]$.

Since $rem^\rho[\iota_\xi[M_Y] + R^*]$ is fixed as Y varies over $\mathcal{Y}$, Lemma 3.3 of [4], implies there is a subcollection $\mathcal{Y}'$ of $\mathcal{Y}$ which is cofinal in λ' such that $\iota_\xi[X_0] \cup (\iota_\xi[M_{Y_1}] + R^*) \cong_\rho \iota_\xi[X_0] \cup (\iota_\xi[M_{Y_2}] + R^*)$ for all $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}'$. Since $min(M_Y) \in Y$ for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $min(M_Y)$ $(Y \in \mathcal{Y}')$ is cofinal in λ'. By the continuity of ι_ξ, $\iota_\xi(min(M_Y))$ $(Y \in \mathcal{Y}')$ is cofinal in $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$. Therefore, $\iota_\xi[M_Y] + R^*$ $(Y \in \mathcal{Y}')$ is cofinal in $\iota_\xi(\lambda')$.

Fix $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$. Since $\iota_\xi(\lambda') \leq^\rho_2 \iota_\xi(\lambda)$, there is a ρ-covering of $\iota_\xi[X_0] \cup (\iota_\xi[M_Y] + R^*)$ into $\iota_\xi(\lambda)$ which fixes $\iota_\xi[X_0]$ and maps $\iota_\xi[M_Y] + R^*$ above $\iota_\xi(\beta)$. Since $\nu_\xi \in \iota_\xi[X_0]$, $h(\nu_\xi) = \nu_\xi$. By part 2 of Lemma 3.2, there is an α-covering h' of $X_0 \cup (M_Y + R)$ into λ such that $h'(\sigma + \gamma) = (\iota_\xi^{-1} \circ h \circ \iota_\xi)(\sigma) + \gamma$ whenever $\sigma + \gamma \in X_0 \cup (M_Y + R)$, σ is divisible by α and $\gamma < \alpha$.

Since the elements of X_0 are divisible by α, an easy argument shows X_0 is fixed by h'.

To show that h' maps $M_Y + R$ above β, it suffices to show h' maps the elements of M_Y above β. This is straightforward from the definition of h' and the fact that the elements of M_Y are divisible by α and h maps $\iota_\xi[M_Y]$ above $\iota_\xi(\beta)$. $\square$

4 The Second Recurrence Theorem for $\leq_2$

Recall that we are assuming ρ is an arbitrary additively indecomposable ordinal and α is an epsilon number greater than ρ.

Lemma 4.1 *If $\eta_1 < \eta_2$ and $\omega^{\eta_2} < \theta_2$ then $J_{\omega^{\eta_1}}$ is ρ-isomorphic to a proper initial segment of $J_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$.*

Proof. Define λ_i so that $J_{\omega^{\eta_i}} = [\nu_{\omega^{\eta_i}}, \nu_{\omega^{\eta_i}} + \lambda_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Notice that λ_2 may be ∞. Let λ be the minimum of λ_1 and λ_2.

Claim. The map from $[\nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}}, \nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}} + \lambda)$ to $[\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}, \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \lambda)$ given by

$$\nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}} + \beta \mapsto \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \beta$$

is a ρ-isomorphism.

As substructures of $\mathcal{R}^\rho$, both $[\nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}}, \nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}} + \lambda)$ and $[\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}, \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \lambda)$ are isomorphic to initial segments of $\mathcal{R}^\rho$ implying $[\nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}}, \nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}} + \lambda)$ is isomorphic to $[\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}, \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \lambda)$ as substructures of $\mathcal{R}^\rho$.

Suppose $\kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_j + \chi_j < \lambda$ and $\chi_j < \kappa_\alpha$ for $j = 1, 2$. We need to show

$$\nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_1 + \chi_1 \leq^\rho_k \nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \chi_2$$

iff

$$\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_1 + \chi_1 \leq^\rho_k \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \chi_2$$

for $k = 1, 2$. This follows from RTSI when $\chi_1 \neq 0$ and from the Order Reduction Theorem when $\chi_1 = \chi_2 = 0$. Assume $\chi_1 = 0$ and $\chi_2 \neq 0$. By RTSI, both sides of the equivalence fail if $k = 2$. So, we may assume $k = 1$. By RTSI again, $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_i}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \kappa_\gamma \leq^\rho_1 \nu_{\omega^{\eta_i}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \chi_2$ for $i = 1, 2$ where $\gamma = index(\chi_2)$. Therefore, $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_i}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_1 \leq^\rho_1 \nu_{\omega^{\eta_i}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \chi_2$ is equivalent to $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_i}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_1 \leq^\rho_1 \nu_{\omega^{\eta_i}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \kappa_\gamma$ for $i = 1, 2$. The Order Reduction Theorem implies that $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_i}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_1 \leq^\rho_1 \nu_{\omega^{\eta_i}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \kappa_\gamma$ iff $\alpha \cdot \delta_1 \leq^\alpha_1 \alpha \cdot \delta_2 + \gamma$ for $i = 1, 2$. The desired equivalence follows.

Argue by contradiction and assume $\lambda_2 \leq \lambda_1$.

Notice that $J_{\omega^{\eta_1}} = [\nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}}, \nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}+1})$ implying $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}} + \lambda_1 = \nu_{\omega^{\eta_1}+1}$ and λ_1 is divisible by κ_α.

First, assume that $\omega^{\eta_2}+1 = \theta_2$. In this case, $J_{\omega^{\eta_2}} = \overline{J}_{\omega^{\eta_2}} = [\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}, max(I_\alpha)]$. We will derive a contradiction by showing $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} \leq^\rho_1 max(I_\alpha) + 1$.

Assume $X \subseteq \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ and $Y \subseteq J_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ are finite ρ-closed sets. We will show there is a ρ-covering of $X \cup Y$ into $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ which fixes X. By part 4 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $X \not\leq_2^\rho Y$. By Lemma 3.9 of [4], it will suffice to find a ρ-covering of Y into $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ which maps Y above X. By the claim, $J_{\omega^{\eta_1}}$ contains a ρ-closed set which is ρ-isomorphic to Y. By the continuity of $\xi \mapsto \nu_\xi$, there exists $\eta < \omega^{\eta_2}$ such that $X < \nu_\eta$. Since $\eta, \omega^{\eta_1} < \omega^{\eta_2}$, $\eta + \omega^{\eta_1} < \omega^{\eta_2}$. By the First Recurrence Theorem for $\leq_2$, $J_{\eta+\omega^{\eta_1}} \cong_\rho J_{\omega_{\eta_1}}$. Therefore, $J_{\eta+\omega^{\eta_1}}$ contains a ρ-closed set $\tilde{Y}$ which is ρ-isomorphic to Y. Since $X < \nu_\eta < \tilde{Y} < \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$, the ρ-isomorphism of Y and $\tilde{Y}$ is the desired ρ-covering of Y.

Now, suppose $\omega^{\eta_2} + 1 < \theta_2$. We will derive a contradiction by showing $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} \leq_2^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2+1}}$. In this case, $J_{\omega^{\eta_2}} = [\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}, \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2+1}})$ and $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2+1}} = \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \lambda_2$. Therefore, λ_2 is divisible by κ_α.

By part 14 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} \leq_2^{\rho\uparrow} \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2+1}}$.

To show $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} \leq_2^{\rho\downarrow} \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2+1}}$, assume $X \subseteq \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ and $Y \subseteq J_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ are finite ρ-closed sets. We will show there is a ρ-covering h of $X \cup Y$ into $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ which fixes X such that $h(\beta) \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ whenever $\beta \in Y$ and $\beta \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2+1}}$. By part 4 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $X \not\leq_2^\rho Y$. By Lemma 3.9 of [4], it will suffice to find a ρ-covering h of Y into $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ which maps Y above X such that $h(\beta) \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ whenever $\beta \in Y$ and $\beta \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2+1}}$. Let R satisfy $Y = \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + R$. Clearly, R is ρ-closed. Choose $\eta < \omega^{\eta_2}$ such that $X < \nu_\eta$. Let $\xi = \eta + \omega^{\eta_1}$. Since $\eta, \omega^{\eta_1} < \omega^{\eta_2}$, $\xi < \omega^{\eta_2}$. By the First Recurrence Theorem for $\leq_2$, $J_{\omega^{\eta_1}} \cong_\rho J_\xi$. This implies $\nu_{\xi+1} = \nu_\xi + \lambda_1$. By the claim, $J_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ is ρ-isomorphic to an initial segment of J_ξ. Therefore, $\nu_\xi + R \cong_\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + R = Y$. Also, $X < \nu_\xi + R < \nu_{\xi+1} \leq \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$.

We consider two cases.

First, suppose $\lambda = \lambda_1 = \lambda_2$.

We claim the ρ-isomorphism $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \zeta \mapsto \nu_\xi + \zeta$ is the desired ρ-covering of Y. To establish this, suppose $\zeta \in R$ and $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \zeta \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2+1}}$. We will show that $\nu_\xi + \zeta \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$. Since $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \zeta \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2+1}} = \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \lambda$, $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \zeta \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \zeta'$ whenever $\zeta \leq \zeta' < \lambda_2$. Since $J_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$ is ρ-isomorphic to an initial segment of J_ξ, $\nu_\xi + \zeta \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi + \zeta'$ whenever $\zeta \leq \zeta' < \lambda_2$. By part 2 of Lemma 3.8 of [4], $\nu_\xi + \zeta \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi + \lambda = \nu_{\xi+1} \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$.

Now, consider the case when $\lambda_2 < \lambda_1$. Since λ_2 is divisible by κ_α, so is $\nu_\xi + \lambda_2$. Since $\nu_\xi + \lambda_2 < \nu_\xi + \lambda_1 = \nu_{\xi+1}$, this implies $\nu_\xi \leq_2^\rho \nu_\xi + \lambda_2$. Therefore, there is a ρ-covering g of $\nu_\xi + R$ into ν_ξ which maps $\nu_\xi + R$ above X such that $g(\nu_\xi + \zeta) \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi$ whenever $\zeta \in R$. Let h be the function on Y defined by $h(\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \zeta) = g(\nu_\xi + \zeta)$. Clearly, h is a ρ-covering of Y.

To complete the proof of this case, assume $\zeta \in R$ and $\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \zeta \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}+1}$. By an argument similar to the previous case, $\nu_\xi + \zeta \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi + \lambda_2$. Therefore, $h(\nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}} + \zeta) = g(\nu_\xi + \zeta) \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta_2}}$. □

Lemma 4.2 *Assume $\omega^\eta < \theta_2$. If $\eta' < \eta$ then $dom(\iota_{\omega^{\eta'}}) \subseteq dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$.*

Proof. Assume $\eta' < \eta$.

Since $\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1}$ is the largest element of $\overline{J}_{\omega^{\eta'}}$, $\varphi_{\omega^{\eta'}}(\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1})$ is the largest element of the domain of $\iota_{\omega^{\eta'}}$. Since $\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1}$ is divisible by κ_α, there exists δ such that $\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1} = \nu_{\omega^{\eta'}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$. Therefore, $\varphi_{\omega^{\eta'}}(\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta) = \alpha \cdot \delta$ is the largest element of the domain of $\iota_{\omega^{\eta'}}$. Since $J_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ is ρ-isomorphic to a proper initial segment of J_{ω_η} by Lemma 4.1, $J_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ is ρ-isomorphic to $[\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta)$ and $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta \in J_{\omega^\eta}$. Therefore, $\alpha \cdot \delta = \varphi_{\omega^\eta}(\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta)$ is in the domain of ι_{ω^η}. Since $\alpha \cdot \delta$ is the largest element of the domain of $\iota_{\omega^{\eta'}}$, $dom(\iota_{\omega^{\eta'}}) \subseteq dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$. □

Lemma 4.3 *Assume $\xi < \theta_2$ and $\nu_\xi <_2^\rho \nu$. If $Y \subseteq [\nu_\xi, \nu)$ is ρ-closed and $\nu_\xi \in Y$ then there exists η such that $\omega^\eta < \xi$ and a ρ-covering h of Y into J_{ω^η} such that $h(\nu_\xi) = \nu_{\omega^\eta}$ and $h(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^\eta+1}$ whenever $\mu \in Y$ and $\mu \leq_1^\rho \nu$.*

Proof. Assume $Y \subseteq [\nu_\xi, \nu)$ is ρ-closed and $\nu_\xi \in Y$.

Since $\nu_\xi <_2^\rho \nu$, parts 1 and 11 of Lemma 8.6 of [4] imply ξ is a limit ordinal. Therefore, there is a ρ-covering h_1 of Y into ν_ξ such that $\nu_1 < h_1[Y]$ and $h_1(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi$ whenever $\mu \in Y$ and $\mu \leq_1^\rho \nu$.

There exists $\xi' < \xi$ such that $h_1(\nu_\xi) \in J_{\xi'}$. Since $\nu_1 < h_1[Y]$, $1 \leq \xi'$.

Define a function h_2 on the range of h_1 such that

$$h_2(\beta + \epsilon) = \begin{cases} \nu_{\xi'} + \epsilon & \text{if } \beta = h_1(\nu_\xi) \\ \beta + \epsilon & \text{if } \beta \neq h_1(\nu_\xi) \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

whenever $\beta + \epsilon$ is in the range of h_1, β is divisible by ρ and $\epsilon < \rho$. By Lemma 2.4 of [4], h_2 is an embedding of the range of h_1 into $\mathcal{R}^\rho$. Clearly, the range of h_2 is contained in $[\nu_{\xi'}, \nu_\xi)$.

Since $\nu_\xi \leq_1^\rho \nu$, $h_1(\nu_\xi) \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi$. By RTSI, $h_1(\nu_\xi)$ is divisible by κ_α. Therefore, $\nu_{\xi'} \leq_2^\rho h_1(\nu_\xi)$. This easily implies that h_2 is a ρ-covering of the range of h_1.

Let X be the intersection of $J_{\xi'}$ with the range of h_2. Since $\nu_{\xi'+1} \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi$, there is a ρ-covering h_3 of the range of h_2 into $\nu_{\xi'+1}$ which fixes X.

Since $\nu_{\xi'}$ is the least element of X and $h_3(\nu_{\xi'}) = \nu_{\xi'}$, $\nu_{\xi'}$ is the least element of the range of h_3. Therefore, the range of h_3 is contained in $[\nu_{\xi'}, \nu_{\xi'+1}) = J_{\xi'}$.

Since $\xi' \neq 0$, $\xi' = \zeta + \omega^\eta$ for some ζ and η. By the First Recurrence Theorem for $\leq_2$, there is an isomorphism h_4 of $\overline{J}_{\xi'}$ and $\overline{J}_{\omega^\eta}$.

Let $h = h_4 \circ h_3 \circ h_2 \circ h_1$.

Since the composition of ρ-coverings is a ρ-covering, h is a ρ-covering of Y.

A simple computation shows that $h(\nu_\xi) = \nu_{\omega^\eta}$.

Since the range of h_3 is contained in $J_{\xi'}$, the range of h is contained in J_{ω^η}.

Assume $\mu \in Y$ and $\mu \leq_1^\rho \nu$. We will show $h(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^\eta+1}$. In the case $\mu = \nu_\xi$, $h(\mu) = \nu_{\omega^\eta}$ implying $h(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^\eta+1}$. So, we may assume $\nu_\xi < \mu$.

By choice of h_1, $h_1(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi$. By RTSI, $h_1(\mu)$ is divisible by κ_α. Since $\nu_\xi \leq_2^\rho \nu$ and $\mu \leq_1^\rho \nu$, $\nu_\xi \leq_2^\rho \mu$. Therefore, $h_1(\nu_\xi) \leq_2^\rho h_1(\mu)$. By part 4 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $h_1(\mu) < \nu_{\xi'+1}$ implying $h_1(\mu) \in J_{\xi'}$. Since $h_1(\nu_\xi) < h_1(\mu)$, this implies $h_2(h_1(\mu)) = h_1(\mu)$. Since h_3 fixes the elements of X, $h_3(h_1(\mu)) = h_1(\mu)$. Therefore, $h(\mu) = h_4(h_1(\mu))$. Since $h_1(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \nu_\xi$, $h_1(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\xi'+1}$. Since h_4 is an isomorphism of $\overline{J}_{\xi'}$ and $\overline{J}_{\omega^\eta}$, $h(\mu) = h_4(h_1(\mu)) \leq_1^\rho h_4(\nu_{\xi'+1}) = \nu_{\omega^\eta+1}$. □

The Second Recurrence Theorem for $\leq_2$ below provides a computation of the lengths of the intervals $\overline{J}_\xi$ in terms of the intervals I^α_β. By the First Recurrence Theorem for $\leq_2$, this reduces to calculating the lengths of the intervals $\overline{J}_\xi$ when ξ has the form ω^η.

Theorem 4.4 (Second Recurrence Theorem for $\leq_2$) *If $\omega^\eta < \theta_2$ and $\eta = \lambda + n$ where $n \in \omega$ and λ is a multiple of ω, possibly 0, then $\alpha \cdot \lambda < \theta_1^\alpha$ and the following hold.*

1. *If $\omega^\eta + 1 < \theta_2$ then the following hold.*
   (a) *If the largest element of $I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\lambda}$ is not a successor multiple of α then the largest element of the domain of ι_{ω^η} is $max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot(\eta+1)})$ i.e. $\kappa^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot(\eta+1)}$.*
   (b) *If the largest element of $I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\lambda}$ is a successor multiple of α then the largest element of the domain of ι_{ω^η} is $max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta})$ which is $\kappa^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta}$ if $n > 0$.*
2. *If $\omega^\eta + 1 = \theta_2$ and $\alpha + 1 < \theta_1$ then the following hold.*

(a) *If the largest element of* $I^{\alpha}_{\alpha\cdot\lambda}$ *is not a successor multiple of* α *then the largest element of the domain of* ι_{ω^η} *is* $max(I^{\alpha}_{\alpha\cdot\eta+\gamma})$ *for some* $\gamma < \alpha$.

(b) *If the largest element of* $I^{\alpha}_{\alpha\cdot\lambda}$ *is a successor multiple of* α *then* η *is a successor ordinal and the largest element of the domain of* ι_{ω^η} *is* $max(I^{\alpha}_{\alpha\cdot\eta'+\gamma})$ *for some* $\gamma < \alpha$ *where* $\eta = \eta' + 1$.

3. *If* $\omega^\eta + 1 = \theta_2$ *and* $\alpha + 1 = \theta_1$ *then* $\eta + 1 = \theta^{\alpha}_1$.

Proof. Recall that Theorem 8.8 of [4] says that either $\theta_2 = \infty$ or $\theta_2 = \theta + 1$ where θ is infinite and additively indecomposable.

Notice that for $\xi < \theta_2$, if J_ξ is unbounded iff $\alpha + 1 = \theta_1$ and $\xi + 1 = \theta_2$. Moreover, J_ξ is unbounded iff the domain of ι_ξ is unbounded.

We claim that if $\xi + 1 < \theta_2$ then the largest element of the domain of ι_ξ is a successor multiple of α. To see this, suppose $\xi + 1 < \theta_2$. The largest element of $\overline{J}_\xi$ is $\nu_{\xi+1}$ which is a successor multiple of κ_α by part 11 of Lemma 8.6 of [4]. Therefore, the largest element of the domain of ι_ξ, $\varphi_\xi(\nu_{\xi+1})$, is a successor multiple of α.

When J_{ω^η} is bounded, define $f(\eta)$ to be the largest β such that $\kappa^{\alpha}_{\beta} \in dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$. By part 3 of Lemma 3.2, if $\xi < \theta_2$ and the domain of ι_ξ intersects I^{α}_{β} then $dom(\iota_\xi)$ contains I^{α}_{β}. Therefore, if J_{ω^η} is bounded then the largest element of $dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$ is $max(I^{\alpha}_{f(\eta)})$. By the previous paragraph, if $\omega^\eta + 1 < \theta_2$ then the largest element of $I^{\alpha}_{f(\eta)}$ is a successor multiple of α.

We will now establish the theorem by induction on η. Let K be the class of ordinals η such that the theorem holds.

Assume η is an ordinal such that $\eta' \in K$ whenever $\eta' < \eta$ and suppose $\omega^\eta < \theta_2$ and $\eta = \lambda + n$ where $n \in \omega$ and λ is a multiple of ω.

Case 1. Assume $\eta = 0$.

In this case, $\lambda = n = 0$ and $\omega^\eta = 1$.

Since $I^{\alpha}_{\alpha\cdot\lambda} = I^{\alpha}_{0} = \{0\}$ by part 1 of Lemma 5.4 of [4], and 0 is not a successor multiple of α, the only clause which is not vacuously true is 2(a).

By parts 1 and 11 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $\nu_m = \kappa_\alpha \cdot (m + 1)$ for $m \in \omega$. Therefore, $\overline{J}_{\omega^\eta} = \overline{J}_1 = [\nu_1, \nu_2] = [\kappa_\alpha \cdot 2, \kappa_\alpha \cdot 3]$ implying that the domain of ι_{ω^η} is $[0, \alpha]$. By parts 1 and 8 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $I^{\alpha}_{\alpha\cdot(\eta+1)} = I^{\alpha}_{\alpha} = \{\alpha\}$. Therefore, the largest element of the domain of ι_{ω^η} is $max(I_{\alpha\cdot(\eta+1)})$.

Case 2. Assume η is a successor ordinal.

Let $\eta = \eta' + 1$. In this case, $n > 0$ and $\eta' = \lambda + (n-1)$. By the induction hypothesis, $\alpha \cdot \lambda < \theta_1^\alpha$.

Since $\omega^{\eta'} + 1 < \theta_2$, the largest element of $\overline{J}_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ is $\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1}$ which is a successor multiple of κ_α. Therefore, there exists a successor ordinal δ such that the largest element of $\overline{J}_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ is $\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$. Therefore, $max(dom(\iota_{\omega^{\eta'}})) = \varphi_{\omega^{\eta'}}(\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1}) = \alpha \cdot \delta$. Since $\overline{J}_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ is bounded, $f(\eta')$ is defined and $max(dom(\iota_{\omega^{\eta'}})) = max(I^\alpha_{f(\eta')})$. Therefore, $max(I^\alpha_{f(\eta')}) = \alpha \cdot \delta$.

Claim 1 for Case 2. $J_{\omega^{\eta'}} \cong_\rho [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta)$ and $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta \in J_{\omega^\eta}$.

By Lemma 4.1, $J_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ is ρ-isomorphic to a proper initial segment of J_{ω^η}. Since $J_{\omega^{\eta'}} = [\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}}, \nu_{\omega^{\eta'}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta)$, this implies that $J_{\omega^{\eta'}} \cong_\rho [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta)$ and $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta \in J_{\omega^\eta}$.

By Lemma 6.7 of [4], there is an α-incompressible set Z whose largest element is $\alpha \cdot \delta$.

Since $\varphi^{-1}_{\omega^\eta}[[0, \alpha \cdot \delta]] = [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta]$, part 2 of Lemma 2.2 implies there exists $Z^* \subseteq \varphi^{-1}_{\omega^\eta}[[0, \alpha \cdot \delta]]$ which is locally incompressible such that $\nu_{\omega^\eta} \in Z^*$ and $\iota_{\omega^\eta}[Z] \subseteq Z^*$.

Claim 2 for Case 2. $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha \notin J_{\omega^\eta}$.

To prove the claim, argue by contradiction and assume $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha \in J_{\omega^\eta}$.

Since $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha$ is divisible by κ_α, $\nu_{\omega^\eta} \leq^\rho_2 \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha$. By Lemma 4.3, there is a $\zeta < \eta$ and ρ-covering of Z^* into J_{ω^ζ} which maps ν_{ω^η} to ν_{ω^ζ}. By Lemma 4.1, J_{ω^ζ} is ρ-isomorphic to an initial segment of $J_{\omega^{\eta'}}$. Therefore, we may assume $\zeta = \eta'$. Since $J_{\omega^{\eta'}} \cong_\rho [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta)$, there is a ρ-covering h of Z^* into $[\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta)$ such that $h(\nu_{\omega^\eta}) = \nu_{\omega^\eta}$.

By part 2 of Lemma 3.2, there is an α-covering h' of Z into $[0, \alpha \cdot \delta]$ such that $h'(\sigma + \gamma) = (\iota^{-1}_{\omega^\eta} \circ h \circ \iota_{\omega^\eta})(\sigma) + \gamma$ whenever $\sigma + \gamma \in Z$, σ is divisible by α and $\gamma < \alpha$.

Since Z in α-incompressible and $\alpha \cdot \delta$ is the largest element of Z, we we will contradict part 9 of Lemma 6.4 of [4] by showing $h'(\alpha \cdot \delta) < \alpha \cdot \delta$. This inequality follows from the definition of h' and the fact that $h(\iota_\xi(\alpha \cdot \delta)) \in h[Z^*] < \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$.

To verify part 1, assume $\omega^\eta + 1 < \theta_2$.

The assumption $\omega^\eta + 1 < \theta_2$ implies $J_{\omega^\eta} = [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta+1})$. Since $\nu_{\omega^\eta+1}$ is a successor multiple of κ_α, Claims 1 and 2 imply that $\nu_{\omega^\eta+1} = \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha$. Therefore,

$$max(dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})) \ = \varphi_{\omega^\eta}(\nu_{\omega^\eta+1})$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \varphi_{\omega^\eta}(\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha) \\
&= \alpha \cdot \delta + \alpha \\
&= max(I^\alpha_{f(\eta')}) + \alpha \\
&= max(I^\alpha_{f(\eta')+\alpha})
\end{aligned}
$$

To establish part 1(a), assume $max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\lambda})$ is not a successor multiple of α. By the induction hypothesis, $f(\eta') = \alpha \cdot (\eta' + 1) = \alpha \cdot \eta$. By the string of equalities above, the largest element of the domain of ι_{ω^η} is $max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot(\eta+1)})$ as desired.

To establish part 1(b), assume $max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\lambda})$ is a successor multiple of α. By the induction hypothesis, $f(\eta') = \alpha \cdot \eta'$. By the string of equalities above, the largest element of the domain of ι_{ω^η} is $max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta})$ as desired.

This concludes the proof of part 1 for Case 2.

To verify part 2, assume $\omega^\eta + 1 = \theta_2$.

The assumption $\omega^\eta + 1 = \theta_2$ implies $\overline{J}_{\omega^\eta} = J_{\omega^\eta}$. Using Claim 2, this implies that $\alpha \cdot \delta + \alpha \notin dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$. On the other hand, Claim 1 implies that $\alpha \cdot \delta \in dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$. Therefore, there exists $\gamma < \alpha$ such that $max(dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})) = \alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$. Similar to the computation above, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
max(dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})) &= \alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma \\
&= max(I^\alpha_{f(\eta')}) + \gamma \\
&= max(I^\alpha_{f(\eta')+\gamma})
\end{aligned}
$$

To establish part 2(a), assume $max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\lambda})$ is not a successor multiple of α. By the induction hypothesis, $f(\eta') = \alpha \cdot (\eta' + 1) = \alpha \cdot \eta$. By the string of equalities above, the largest element of the domain of ι_{ω^η} is $max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\alpha+\gamma})$ and $\gamma < \alpha$ as desired.

To establish part 2(b), assume $max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\lambda})$ is a successor multiple of α. By the induction hypothesis, $f(\eta') = \alpha \cdot \eta'$. By the string of equalities above, the largest element of the domain of ι_{ω^η} is $max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta'+\gamma})$ and $\gamma < \alpha$ as desired.

This concludes the proof of part 2 for Case 2.

Since Claim 2 implies that J_{ω^η} is bounded, the hypothesis of part 3 fails and part 3 holds vacuously.

Case 3. Assume η is a limit ordinal.

In this case, $n = 0$ and $\lambda = \eta$.

By the induction hypothesis, part 1 of the theorem holds with η replaced by η' for all $\eta' < \eta$. Since $f(\eta')$ is either $\alpha \cdot \eta'$ or $\alpha \cdot (\eta' + 1)$ for all $\eta' < \eta$,

$\alpha \cdot \eta$ is the least upper bound of the ordinals $f(\eta')$ for $\eta' < \eta$ and $\alpha \cdot \eta < \theta_1^\alpha$. Moreover, if $\eta_1 < \eta_2 < \eta$ then $f(\eta_1) < f(\eta_2)$.

By Lemma 4.2, $\kappa^\alpha_{f(\eta')} \in dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$ for $\eta' < \eta$. Since the domain of ι_η is a closed interval, this implies that $\kappa^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta} \in dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$. Therefore, $I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta}$ is a subset of $dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$.

First, suppose $I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta}$ is unbounded. This implies that $\alpha \cdot \eta + 1 = \theta_1^\alpha$. By Corollary 7.3 of [4], $\alpha \cdot \eta$ is an epsilon number greater than α implying $\alpha \cdot \eta = \eta$ and, hence, $\eta + 1 = \theta_1^\alpha$. Since $I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta}$ a subset of the domain of ι_{ω^η}, J_{ω^η} is unbounded implying $\omega^\eta + 1 = \theta_2$. Therefore, the conclusion of part 3 holds. Parts 1 and 2 hold vacuously.

For the remainder of the proof, assume $I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta}$ is bounded. This makes part 3 vacuously true.

Write the largest element of $I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta}$ as $\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$ where $\gamma < \alpha$.

Claim 1 for Case 3. $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\gamma \in \overline{J}_{\omega^\eta}$.

This follows from the fact $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\gamma = \iota_{\omega^\eta}(\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma)$.

Claim 2 for Case 3. If $\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$ is not a successor multiple of α then $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\gamma \in J_{\omega^\eta}$.

Assume $\alpha\cdot\delta+\gamma$ is not a successor multiple of α. This implies $\nu_{\omega^\eta}+\kappa_\alpha\cdot\delta+\kappa_\gamma$ is not a successor multiple of κ_α. By Claim 1, $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\gamma \in \overline{J}_{\omega^\eta}$. In case $\omega^\eta + 1 = \theta_2$, $\overline{J}_{\omega^\eta} = J_{\omega^\eta}$ and the desired conclusion follows. Suppose $\omega^\eta + 1 < \theta_2$. Since $\overline{J}_{\omega^\eta} = [\nu_{\omega^\eta}\nu_{\omega^\eta+1}]$ and $\nu_{\omega^\eta+1}$ is a successor multiple of κ_α, $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\gamma \in [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta+1}) = J_{\omega^\eta}$.

By Lemma 6.7 of [4], there is an α-incompressible set Z such that $max(Z) = \alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$. By part 2 of Lemma 2.2, there is a locally incompressible subset Z^* of $[\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_{\gamma+1})$ such that $\iota_{\omega^\eta}[Z] \subseteq Z^*$ and $\nu_{\omega^\eta} \in Z^*$. By part 13 of Lemma 8.6 of [4], $[\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_{\gamma+1}) \subseteq \overline{J}_{\omega^\eta}$. Therefore, Z^* is a subset of $\overline{J}_{\omega^\eta}$.

Claim 3 for Case 3. $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha \notin J_{\omega^\eta}$.

The proof is similar to that of Claim 2 for Case 2.

Argue by contradiction and assume $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha \in J_{\omega^\eta}$.

Since $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha$ is divisible by κ_α, $\nu_{\omega^\eta} \leq^\rho_2 \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha$. By Lemma 4.3, there is a $\eta' < \eta$ and ρ-covering h_1 of Z^* into $J_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ which maps ν_{ω^η} to $\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}}$. Since $\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1}$ is a multiple of κ_α, there exists δ' such that $\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1} = \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta'$. Since $max(\overline{J}_{\omega^{\eta'}}) = \nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1}$, this implies $max(I^\alpha_{f(\eta')}) = max(dom(\iota_{\omega^{\eta'}})) = \varphi_{\omega^{\eta'}}(\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta') = \alpha \cdot \delta'$. Since $f(\eta') < \alpha \cdot \eta$, this implies $\alpha \cdot \delta' < \alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$.

By Lemma 4.1, $J_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ is ρ-isomorphic to a proper initial segment of J_{ω^η}. Let h_2 be the ρ-isomorphism of $J_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ and $[\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega_\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta')$. Let $h = h_2 \circ h_1$. h is a ρ-covering of Z^* into $[\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta')$ and $h(\nu_{\omega^\eta}) = \nu_{\omega_\eta}$. By part 2 of Lemma 3.2, there is an α-covering h' of Z into $[0, \alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma]$ such that $h'(\sigma + \zeta) = (\iota_{\omega^\eta}^{-1} \circ h \circ \iota_{\omega^\eta})(\sigma) + \zeta$ whenever $\sigma + \zeta \in Z$, σ is divisible by α and $\zeta < \alpha$.

We claim h' maps Z into $[0, \alpha \cdot \delta')$ which contradicts fact Z is α-incompressible. To see this, it suffices to show $h'(\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma) < \alpha \cdot \delta'$. Since $h(\iota_\xi(\alpha \cdot \delta)) \in h[Z*] < \nu_{\omega^{\omega^\eta}} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta'$, the definition of h' implies $h'(\alpha \cdot \delta) < \alpha \cdot \delta'$. Since α is additively indecomposable, $h'(\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma) = h'(\alpha \cdot \delta) + \gamma < \alpha \cdot \delta'$.

Claim 4 for Case 3. If $\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$ is a successor multiple of α then $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta \notin J_{\omega^\eta}$.

Argue by contradiction and assume $\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$ is a successor multiple of α but $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta \in J_{\omega^\eta}$. This implies δ is a successor ordinal and $\gamma = 0$. Therefore, $Z^* \subseteq [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_1) = [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta]$.

Since $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$ is divisible by κ_α, $\nu_{\omega^\eta} \leq_2^\rho \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$. Let Z^- be $Z^* - \{\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta\}$. Since $Z^* \subseteq [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta]$, $Z^- \subseteq [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta)$. By Lemma 4.3, there is a $\eta' < \eta$ and ρ-covering h_1 of Z^- into $J_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ such that $h_1(\nu_{\omega^\eta}) = \nu_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ and $h_1(\mu) \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1}$ whenever $\mu \in Z^-$ and $\mu \leq_1^\rho \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$. Since $\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1}$ is a multiple of κ_α, there exists δ' such that $\nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1} = \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta'$. Since $max(\overline{J}_{\omega^{\eta'}}) = \nu_{\omega^{\eta'}+1}$, this implies $max(I^\alpha_{f(\eta')}) = max(dom(\iota_{\omega^{\eta'}})) = \varphi_{\omega^{\eta'}}(\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta') = \alpha \cdot \delta'$. Since $f(\eta') < \alpha \cdot \eta$, this implies $\alpha \cdot \delta' < \alpha \cdot \delta$.

By Lemma 4.1, $J_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ is ρ-isomorphic to a proper initial segment of J_{ω^η}. Let h_2 be the ρ-isomorphism of $J_{\omega^{\eta'}}$ and $[\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega_\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta')$. Define h on Z^* by

$$h(\beta) = \begin{cases} h_2(h_1(\beta)) & \text{if } \beta \neq \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta \\ \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta' & \text{if } \beta = \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Notice that the range of h is contained in $[\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta']$.

We claim that h is a ρ-covering of Z^*. By Lemma 2.4 of [4], h is an embedding of Z^* into $\mathcal{R}^\rho$.

Clearly, the restriction of h to Z^- is a ρ-covering of Z^-.

Since δ is a successor ordinal, $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$ is not a limit of ordinals which are divisible by κ_α. Since $\nu_{\omega^\eta} \leq_2^\rho \mu$ implies μ is divisible by κ_α, $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$ is not a limit of ordinals μ with $\nu_{\omega^\eta} \leq_2^\rho \mu$. By part 2 of Lemma 3.6 of [4], there is no μ such that $\nu_{\omega^\eta} < \mu$ and $\mu <_2^\rho \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$.

Since $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta' < \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta \in \overline{J}_{\omega^\eta}$, $\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta' \in J_{\omega^\eta}$ and $\nu_{\omega^\eta} \leq_2^\rho \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta'$. This fact and the conclusions of the previous two paragraphs easily imply h is a ρ-covering of Z^*.

By part 2 of Lemma 3.2, there is an α-covering h' of Z into $[0, \alpha \cdot \delta]$ such that $h'(\sigma + \zeta) = (\iota_{\omega^\eta}^{-1} \circ h \circ \iota_{\omega^\eta})(\sigma) + \zeta$ whenever $\sigma + \zeta \in Z$, σ is divisible by α and $\zeta < \alpha$.

Clearly, $h'(\alpha \cdot \delta) = \alpha \cdot \delta'$. Since $\alpha \cdot \delta = max(Z)$ and $\delta' < \delta$, this contradicts the fact that Z is α-incompressible.

To verify part 1, assume $\omega^\eta + 1 < \theta_2$. This implies that $J_{\omega^\eta} = [\nu_{\omega^\eta}, \nu_{\omega^\eta+1})$.

To establish part 1(a), assume $\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$ is not a successor multiple of α. We will show that $max(dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})) = max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot(\eta+1)})$. Since $\nu_{\omega^\eta+1}$ is a successor multiple of κ_α, Claims 2 and 3 imply that $\nu_{\omega^\eta+1} = \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} max(dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})) &= \varphi_{\omega^\eta}(\nu_{\omega^\eta+1}) \\ &= \varphi_{\omega^\eta}(\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta + \kappa_\alpha) \\ &= \alpha \cdot \delta + \alpha \\ &= \alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma + \alpha \\ &= max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta}) + \alpha \\ &= max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta+\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

To establish part 1(b), assume $\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$ is a successor multiple of α. We will show that $max(dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})) = max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta})$. In this case $\gamma = 0$. Since $\nu_{\omega^\eta+1}$ is a successor multiple of κ_α, Claims 1 and 4 imply that $\nu_{\omega^\eta+1} = \nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} max(dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})) &= \varphi_{\omega^\eta}(\nu_{\omega^\eta+1}) \\ &= \varphi_{\omega^\eta}(\nu_{\omega^\eta} + \kappa_\alpha \cdot \delta) \\ &= \alpha \cdot \delta \\ &= \alpha \cdot \delta \\ &= max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta}) \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of part 1 for Case 2.

To verify part 2, assume $\omega^\eta + 1 = \theta_2$.

The assumption $\omega^\eta + 1 = \theta_2$ implies $\overline{J}_{\omega^\eta} = J_{\omega^\eta}$. By Claims 1 and 4, $\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma$ is not a successor multiple of α making part 2(b) vacuously true.

By Claim 3 and the fact $\overline{J}_{\omega^\eta} = J_{\omega^\eta}$, $\alpha \cdot \delta + \alpha \notin dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$. Since $\alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma \in dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})$, this implies there exists $\gamma' < \alpha$ such that $max(dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})) = \alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma + \gamma'$. To establish part 2(a), we will show that $max(dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})) = max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\delta+\gamma'})$.

$$\begin{aligned} max(dom(\iota_{\omega^\eta})) &= \alpha \cdot \delta + \gamma + \gamma' \\ &= max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta}) + \gamma' \\ &= max(I^\alpha_{\alpha\cdot\eta+\gamma'}) \end{aligned}$$

□

REFERENCES

1. J. Barwise, **Admissible Sets and Structures**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1975.

2. T. Carlson, *Patterns of resemblance of order 2*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 158 (2009), pp. 90-124.

3. T. Carlson, *Generalizing Kruskal's Theorem to pairs of cohabitating trees*,Archive for Mathematical Logic 55 (2016), pp. 37-48.

4. T. Carlson, *Structural Properties of $\mathcal{R}_2$ Part I*, preprint.